

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/620,314
Amendment dated June 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 18, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and continued examination of the above-identified application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-45 are pending and claim 46 has been canceled by way of this amendment.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Document No. JP 1-283367 A. The Examiner relies upon the English abstract of the Japanese document and asserts that this abstract shows a method of resistance welding a sputtering target to a backing plate. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The undersigned would appreciate seeing a full translation of this Japanese document to ensure that the English abstract is accurate. The undersigned believes there are several PTO Board Decisions that encourage the reliance on full English translations as opposed to English abstracts. While the undersigned has canceled claim 46 with the understanding that the English abstract is accurate, the applicants would appreciate if the PTO could obtain a full English translation to confirm this point.

At the bottom of page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner then rejects claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suter (U.S. Patent No. 3,511,962) or Lachman (U.S. Patent No. 828,033). The Examiner asserts that each of these references show a method of joining metal members by contacting a projection with a groove and conducting an electrical current to cause resistance heating of the projections and grooves. The Examiner further asserts that these references show applying a force between the projections and grooves. The Examiner does recognize that the cited references do not indicate a partial deforming of the projection to at least partially fill a groove, though the Examiner believes this deformation or groove filling would be

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/620,314
Amendment dated June 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 18, 2005

obvious. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 45, the applicants believe that claim 45 is not obvious in view of the cited references because neither reference shows the formation of a mechanical bond between the members. While the cited references appear to relate to the welding of metal plates, there is no formation of a mechanical bond. Claim 45 recites that the projection is partially deformed to fill in a groove by applying force between the projection and groove and claim 45 further recites that this deforming and filling of the groove forms at least a mechanical bond between the members. If one studies the particular figures of Suter and Lachman, one will see that there is no teaching or suggestion of forming a mechanical bond. At best, Lachman and Suter form only a welded bond between a projection and a socket, and the shape of projection and socket would not permit a mechanical bond. The projections and sockets of the cited art are shaped such that deformation is not occurring, but welding is only used to connect the pieces. Deformation and formation of a mechanical bond would not be obvious since this is not shown or suggested in the cited art and the Examiner has not pointed to any prior art showing such a step in resistance welding. Thus, the applicants believe that the two references relied upon by the Examiner do not teach or even suggest the subject matter of claim 45 which requires the formation of a mechanical bond. To assist the Examiner, paragraph [0031] of the present application further explains how upon deforming of the projection, an inner lock forms between the projection and groove to form inner locking mechanical connections. In addition, this is further shown in the figures of the present application. Accordingly, for these reasons, the applicants believe that the cited references do not teach or suggest claim 45 and for these reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn.

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 1-44 are allowable over the prior art of record. The applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of the allowability of this

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/620,314
Amendment dated June 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 18, 2005

subject matter. The applicants believe that in view of the comments set forth above, claim 45 is equally allowable.


Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the above differences between claim 45 and the cited references, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 03-0060. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and should also be charged to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Luke A. Kilyk
Reg. No. 33,251

Atty. Docket No. 02116 (3600-416)
KILYK & BOWERSOX, P.L.L.C.
53 A East Lee Street
Warrenton, VA 20186
Tel.: (540) 428-1701
Fax: (540) 428-1720